arXiv:quant-ph/9808059v1 27 Aug 1998

Still Baking

Nathan Salwen
Lyman Laboratory of Physics
Harvard University
salwen@fas.harvard.edu

Ron Rubin
Mathematics Department
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
rubin@math.mit.edu

(February 1, 2008)

We present here a simple proof of the non-existence of a non-periodic invariant point for the quantum baker's map propagator presented in [1], for Planck's constant $h = 1/N$ and N a positive integer.

Introduction A periodic quantum propagator was recently proposed in ref. [1] which solved the parity violating problem of the original quantization due to Balazs and Voros (ref. [2]). We present here a simple proof of the non-existence of a non-periodic invariant point for this quantum baker's map, for Planck's constant $h = 1/N$ and N any positive integer.

We review briefly the quantization. The quantum algebra of observables is restricted to the set bounded operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ generated by the quantization of the classical generators of functions on a torus: $U = \exp(2\pi i\widehat{x})$ and $V = \exp(2\pi i\widehat{p})$so that $UV = e^{4\pi^2 i\hbar}VU$. A quantum propagator was constructed by quantizing the dynamics of a covering map on the plane.The quantum dynamics induced on the algebra of observables for the quantum torus is the quantum baker's map. The covering dynamics is given by the following mapping of $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$(x', p') \begin{cases} (2x, p/2), & (x,p) \in l \cap e_p; \\ (2x-1, p/2+1/2), & (x,p) \in r \cap e_p; \\ (2x+1, p/2+1/2), & (x,p) \in l \cap o_p; \\ (2x, p/2), & (x,p) \in r \cap o_p, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} l &:= \langle [0, 1/2) + \mathbb{Z} \rangle \times \mathbb{R}, \\ r &:= \langle [1/2, 1) + \mathbb{Z} \rangle \times \mathbb{R}, \\ e_p &:= \mathbb{R} \times \langle [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}) + \mathbf{2}\mathbb{Z} \rangle, \\ o_p &:= \mathbb{R} \times \langle [\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}) + \mathbf{2}\mathbb{Z} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

A corresponding quantum propagator which returns the classical baker covering dynamics as $\hbar \to 0$ was found:

$$F = S(L + e^{-i\widehat{x}/\hbar}R)(E_p + e^{-i\widehat{p}/2\hbar}O_p), \tag{1}$$

where S is the unitary stretching and shrinking operator $S^\dagger \widehat{x} S = 2\widehat{x}$, and $S^\dagger \widehat{p} S = \widehat{p}/2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} L &:= \int_{[0,1/2)+\mathbb{Z}} |x\rangle \langle x| \; dx, \\ R &:= \int_{[1/2,1)+\mathbb{Z}} |x\rangle \langle x| \; dx, \\ E_p &:= \int_{[0,1)+2\mathbb{Z}} |p\rangle \langle p| \; dp, \\ O_p &:= \int_{[1,2)+2\mathbb{Z}} |p\rangle \langle p| \; dp. \end{aligned}$$

For $h = 1/N$ the algebra generated by U and V has a natural center generated by

$$X = U^N = e^{i\hat{x}/\hbar}, \quad Y = V^N = e^{i\hat{p}/\hbar}.$$

That is

$$[X,Y] = [X,U] = [X,V] = [Y,U] = [Y,V] = 0.$$

In ref. [3] and [4], this insight was used to show that $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed via the following eigenvalue problem:

$$X\Phi = e^{2\pi i\theta_1}\Phi,$$
$$Y\Phi = e^{2\pi i\theta_2}\Phi,$$

where $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2$. The simultaneous subspace $\mathcal{H}_\hbar(\theta)$ of X and Y has dimension $N = 1/h$, and the following inner product over the fundamental domain $D = [0,1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ was derived:

$$(\Psi_1(\theta), \Psi_2(\theta))_P \tag{2}$$
$$= \int_0^1 \overline{\Psi_1(x,\theta)}(K\Psi_2)(x,\theta)dx, \tag{3}$$

where

$$K\Psi_2(x,\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(x,y)\,\Psi_2(y,\theta)dy,$$
$$K(x,y) = \frac{\sin \pi N(x-y)}{\pi(x-y)} e^{-\frac{\pi N}{2}\left((x-y)^2 + i(x-y)\right)}$$

A normalized "position state basis" was found to be the set $\left\{\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\right\}$, with $0 \le m < N-1$ and

$$\Phi_m^{(\theta)} = \frac{e^{2\pi i\theta_2 m/N}}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi i\theta_2 k} \left|\frac{\theta_1 + m}{N} + k\right\rangle_x. \tag{4}$$

These are the δ-comb wavefunctions seen for example in ref. [5].

The point $\theta = (0,0)$ of the "θ-torus" corresponds to the N-dimensional vector space $\mathcal{H}_\hbar(0)$ of periodic δ-combs. For the quantum baker's map, it was shown that $\theta = (0,0)$ is an invariant point of the dynamics on the θ-torus *for N even.* That is, the set of periodic δ-combs is mapped onto itself by F. Restricted to this subspace, the propagator F is given by the following matrix operator

$$(\mathcal{Z})\left(\mathcal{F}^N\right)1\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{F}^{N/2} & 0\\ 0 & -\mathcal{F}^{N/2}\end{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}^{-2}\right), \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^N_{nm} = N^{-1/2}\exp(2\pi i nm/N)$ is the $N \times N$ discrete Fourier transform matrix $\mathcal{Z}_{nm} = \delta_{nm}\exp(i\pi n/N)$. The form of $\mathcal{Z}_{nm}$ may be misleading for n and m outside of the fundamental range $[0, N-1]$. In general, we write $(\mathcal{Z})_{nm} = \delta_{nm}\exp(i\pi(n/N - [n/N]))$, where $[n/N]$ represents the integer part of n/N.

Are there more invariant points? An antiperiodic quantization scheme proposed by Saraceno in ref. [6] leads to the question of whether other points on the θ-torus (for instance $\theta = (1/2, 1/2)$ corresponding to anti-periodic boundary conditions) are invariant. We demonstrate here that for the propagator 1 this will never occur.

Assume there is such an invariant point. Then by definition, there exists some value of θ such that

$$XF\Phi_m^{(\theta)} = e^{2\pi i\theta_1}F\Phi_m^{(\theta)} \tag{6}$$

and

$$YF\Phi_m^{(\theta)} = e^{2\pi i\theta_2}F\Phi_m^{(\theta)}. \tag{7}$$

We shall use $Y^{1/2} = e^{i\hat{p}/2\hbar}$. The first thing to do is get the commutation relations straight:

$$Y^{1/2}L = RY^{1/2},\; Y^{1/2}X = (-1)^N XY^{1/2},$$
$$X^{-1}E_p = O_pX^{-1},\; LR = E_pO_p = 0.$$

Thus, we find

$$\begin{aligned}XF\Phi_m^{(\theta)} &= XS(L+X^{-1}R)(E_p+Y^{-1/2}O_p)\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\\ &= S(L+X^{-1}R)(E_p+Y^{-1/2}O_p)X^2\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\\ &= e^{2\pi i(2\theta_1)}F\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\end{aligned}$$

Comparing with eqn. 6 we see that $\theta_1 = 0$. Also

$$\begin{aligned}&YS(L+X^{-1}R)(E_p+Y^{-1/2}O_p)\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\\ &= S(R+(-1)^N X^{-1}L)(E_p+Y^{-1/2}O_p)Y^{1/2}\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\\ &= S((-1)^N XR+L)(O_p+(-1)^N Y^{-1/2}E_p)Y^{1/2}\Phi_m^{(\theta)},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\theta_1 = 0$ in the last step. Substituting this into eqn. 7, we find

$$\begin{aligned}&S((-1)^N XR+L)(e^{2\pi i\theta_2}Y^{-1/2}O_p+(-1)^N E_p)\Phi_m^{(\theta)}\\ &\quad = e^{2\pi i\theta_2}S(L+X^{-1}R)(E_p+Y^{-1/2}O_p)\Phi_m^{(\theta)}.\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \left(YF-e^{2\pi i\theta_2}F\right)\Phi_m^{(0,\theta_2)}\\ &= \left((-1)^N - e^{2\pi i\theta_2}\right)SLE_p\Phi_m^{(0,\theta_2)}\\ &\quad + \left(1-e^{2\pi i\theta_2}\right)SX^{-1}RE_p\Phi_m^{(0,\theta_2)}\\ &\quad + e^{2\pi i\theta_2}\left((-1)^N-1\right)SX^{-1}RY^{-1/2}O_p\Phi_m^{(0,\theta_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the operator LS^{-1} on the left gives the condition $(-1)^N = e^{2\pi i\theta_2}$ so that $\theta_2 = 0$ if N is even and $\theta_2 = 1/2$ if N is odd. For the even case, it follows that $\theta = (0,0)$ is the only invariant point. For the odd case, we are left with

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(YF-e^{2\pi i\theta_2}F\right)\Phi_m^{(0,\theta_2)}\\ &= 2SX^{-1}R\left(E_p+Y^{-1/2}O_p\right)\Phi_m^{(0,1/2)},\end{aligned}$$

and this operator will never vanish everywhere.

Discussion What this means is that for the propagator presented in ref. [1], it is impossible to construct an N-dimensional subspace which is invariant under U, V and F except for the case of N even and periodic boundary conditions.

We were led to look for non-periodic invariant points by the work of Saraceno (ref. [6]). He has proposed an "anti-periodic" quantization which differs from both eqn. 5 and the Balazs-Voros quantization by a correction of order $\hbar$. That work defines U and V similarly to the definitions in [1] and demands that $U^N = V^N = -1$. In the terminology we use here, this would be at $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 1/2$. The preceding calculation indicates that this point is not an invariant point of the propagator given by eqn. 1.

In fact, the general impossibility of finding this point invariant is evident by considering the momentum basis of the $\theta = (1/2, 1/2)$ eigenspace.

$$\tilde{\Phi}_n^{(\theta_1,\theta_2)} = e^{-2\pi i n\theta_1/N}\sum_k e^{-2\pi i\theta_1 k}\left|\frac{\theta_2+n}{N}+k\right\rangle_p$$

Under the bakers map, for $n = 0$, the states centered at $p = \theta_2/N + k$ would go to states centered at $p = \theta_2/(2N) + k/2$ which are not in our subspace for $\theta_2 \neq 0$. Thus, even under the classical baker's map, the region of phase space corresponding to states with antiperiodic boundary conditions does not map into itself.

While it might be possible to change the quantum propagator (eqn. 1) in order to make $\theta = (1/2, 1/2)$ be a fixed point, it is hard to imagine what could be done for general $\hbar$ which would have just the right effect for $h = 1/N$. We are thus led to believe that the quantization in ref. [6], while drawing inspiration from anti-periodic states does not have a direct analogue within the more explicit quantization approach of ref. [1].

[1] R. Rubin and N. Salwen, Ann. Phys. **to appear**, (1998), see http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/9801058.
[2] N. Balazs and A. Voros, Ann. Phys. **190**, 1 (1989).
[3] A. Lesniewski, R. Rubin, and N. Salwen, J. Math. Phys. **39**, 1835 (1998).
[4] S. Klimek, A. Lesniewski, N. Maitra, and R. Rubin, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 67 (1997).
[5] J. Hannay and M. Berry, Physica **1D**, 267 (1980).
[6] M. Saraceno, Ann. Phys. **199**, 37 (1990).